UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,096	09/24/2003	Chung Kei Wong	50269-0563	6355
73066 7590 04/08/2008 HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP/Yahoo! Inc. 2055 Gateway Place			EXAMINER	
			JACKSON, JAKIEDA R	
Suite 550 San Jose, CA 95110-1083			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
·			2626	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/08/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/671,096	WONG, CHUNG KEI			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	JAKIEDA R. JACKSON	2626			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>31 A</u>	ugust 2007				
	action is non-final.				
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims	•				
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-9 and 13</u> is/are rejected.					
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>10-12 and 14-16</u> is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.				
Application Papers	•				
··· _					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine		-vaminar			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
	• , ,	, ,			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct		,			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	anniler. Note the attached Office	Action of form PTO-132.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:					
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	a.			
Attachment(s)					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) ∐ Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal P				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/671,096 Page 2

Art Unit: 2626

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on January 18, 2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant argues that neither Bharat nor Evan teach a single compound word that is not separated by a space. Applicant's arguments are persuasive, but are moot in view of new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. **Claims 1-9 and 13** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bharat et al. (USPN 7,249,121), hereinafter referenced as Bharat in view of Evans et al. (USPN 6,363,179), hereinafter referenced as Evans and in further view of Noble (USPN 6,729,882)

Regarding **claim 1**, Bharat discloses a method of displaying a compound word, the method comprising:

a search engine (search engine) receiving query terms that comprise a component word (column 1, line 50 – column 4, line 42 with column 6, lines 40-54);

said search engine generating search results, wherein said search results contain an item that contains said compound word (compound word; column 1, line 50 – column 4, line 42 with column 6, lines 40-54); and

said search engine locating said component word within said compound word (column 1, line 50 – column 4, line 42 with column 6, lines 40-54), but does not specifically teach wherein said search engine displaying a word with to make it visibly distinguished from the remainder of the word in said search results and a single unspaced compound word.

Evans teaches a method and computer-readable storage medium (column 3, line 46 – column 4, line 11) comprising a search engine receiving query terms (figure 4(a), element 400 with column 5, lines 30-67) wherein said search engine generates search results (figure 4(a), element 402) and wherein said search engine displaying a word with to make it visibly distinguished from the remainder of the word in said search results (figure 4(a), elements 404-408 with column 5, lines 30-67), to allow very relevant contexts of search terms within document text to be featured to the user.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bharat's method wherein said search engine displaying a word with to make it visibly distinguished from the remainder of the word in

said search results, as taught by Evans, for facilitating the identification of which parts of a document match search terms when displaying an image document and making it easier for a user to determine whether a matching document is relevant by making the displayed information visually distinct (column 1, line 63 – column 2, line 19).

Bharat in view of Evans teaches a method of displaying a compound word, but does not specifically teach a single unspaced word.

Noble teaches a method of searching a database (column 24, lines 24-31) wherein the compound word is a single unspaced word (compound word is composed of two or more *juxtaposed words* with the combination behaving as a single word; column 28, line 25 – column 29, line 31), wherein the component word is a sequence of two or more letters within the compound word (fireplug; column 28, line 25 – column 29, line 31) and wherein the component word is less than all of the compound word (day in daybed or arm in armchair; column 28, line 25 – column 29, line 31), to have various ways to display a compound word.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bharat in view of Evans method wherein the compound word is a single unspaced word as taught by Noble, to allow a compound word to be displayed in various ways, such a joined together, hyphenated or simply placed together (column 28, line 25 – column 29, line 31).

Regarding **claim 2**, Bharat discloses a method further comprising:

Application/Control Number: 10/671,096 Page 5

Art Unit: 2626

the search engine selecting, based on said component word, from a plurality of resources, one or more resources that are associated with said component word (column 1, line 50 – column 4, line 42 with column 6, lines 40-54).

Regarding claims 3, Bharat discloses a method further comprising:

said search engine displaying one or more portions of said one or more resources, one or more resources that are associated with said component word (column 1, line 50 – column 4, line 42 with column 6, lines 40-54).

Regarding **claim 4**, it is interpreted and rejected for the same reasons as set forth in the combination of claims 1 and 2.

Regarding **claims 5-8 and 13**, Bharat discloses a computer-readable storage medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform the method (column 3, line 10 – column 4, line 4).

Regarding **claim 9**, it is interpreted and rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 9. In addition, Evans discloses a method comprising determining a plurality of stem words that are associated with said compound word (column 28, line 25 – column 29, line 31) and determining for each stem word of he plurality of stem words, (a) a starting position that is associated with that particular stem word and (b) an ending position that is associated with that particular stem word (column 28, line 25 – column 29, line 31).

Allowable Subject Matter

Application/Control Number: 10/671,096 Page 6

Art Unit: 2626

5. Claims 10-12 and 14-16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAKIEDA R. JACKSON whose telephone number is (571)272-7619. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 5:30am-2:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached on 571-272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JRJ
April 1, 2008
/David R Hudspeth/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626